DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 222 UD 026 356

AUTHOR Claus, Richard N.; Quimper, Barry E.
TITLE Compensatory Education Process Evaluation: Elementary and Secondary Academic Achievement (A2) 1987-1988.
INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jan 88
NOTE 53p.; For earlier report, see ED 281 851. For related document, see ED 291 856.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Principals; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; Secondary School Students; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Michigan (Saginaw); Saginaw City School System MI

ABSTRACT

The School District of the City of Saginaw, Michigan operates a compensatory education delivery system in reading and mathematics consisting of two programs, elementary and secondary Academic Achievement (A2). The goal of the programs is to improve the reading and mathematics achievement of a designated number of educationally disadvantaged children, who are screened for entry with the California Achievement Tests--Form E (CAT). A process evaluation, which involves monitoring a program throughout the year, was conducted to determine if the program is being implemented as planned. Thirty-five compensatory education teachers and 22 principals at compensatory education buildings replied to a set of questionnaires concerning the following: (1) programming and instructional management; (2) communications; (3) pupil selection; and (4) miscellaneous, such as program strengths. These responses were then synthesized into a report on the strengths and weaknesses of the A2 programs based on the four reporting areas. The results of the process evaluation were combined with the results of an evaluation of the pupils' academic achievement to form a set of recommendations for improving the implementation of the A2 program for the coming year. Copies of the questionnaires distributed to elementary and secondary principals and teachers, and the results of the 1987-88 process surveys are included in two appendices. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

8-23-8

ED298222

EVALUATION REPORT

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (A^2)

1987-1988

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

Saginaw Public Schools

Saginaw, Michigan

CE 053 572

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard N. Claus
School District of the City of Saginaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (A^2)

1987-1988

An Approved Report of the

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

Richard N. Claus, Ph.D.
Manager, Program Evaluation

Barry E. Quimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing & Research

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent and
Dr. Jerry R. Baker, Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Personnel
School District of the City of Saginaw

January, 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES	4
PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA	5
Strengths of A^2 Program	6
Weaknesses of the A^2 Program	8
RECOMMENDATIONS	10
APPENDICES	11
Appendix A: Academic Achievement (A^2) Chapter 1/Article 3 Compensatory Education Process Surveys 1987-1988 for Teachers and Elementary and Secondary Principals	12
Appendix B: Results of the Chapter/Article 3 A^2 Process Surveys for Teachers and Principals	34

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School District of the City of Saginaw operates a compensatory education delivery system in reading and mathematics consisting of two programs--elementary and secondary Academic Achievement (A^2). The elementary A^2 is a pull-out program periodically taking students out of regular classrooms which involved approximately 2,354 students in grades one through six. The secondary A^2 is a self-contained classroom program which involved approximately 413 students in grades seven through nine. The A^2 programs are funded by both the Federal Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter 1 and Article 3 of the State School Aid Act.

Summarized in the chart below are demographic characteristics that describe both the elementary and secondary levels of A^2 and in greater detail.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAMS

Program	Grade Levels Served	Approximate Number of Students Served	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Teachers	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Aides	Number of School Sites	Program Setting*	Instructional Services
Academic Achievement, Elementary	1-6	2,354	36.0	4.0	23	Pull-out	- Reading - Mathematics
Academic Achievement, Secondary	7-9	413	8.4	0.0	3	Self-Contained Classroom	- Reading - Mathematics

*Students in intact classrooms receive 75% or more of their compensatory education instruction within the confines of the classroom, while students in the pull-out program receive 75% or more of their compensatory instruction outside the confines of their regular classroom.

As can be seen from the chart above, the primary purpose of the programs is to improve the reading and mathematics achievement of a designated number of educationally disadvantaged children. The children in the program are screened for entry with the California Achievement Tests--Form E (CAT). This year approximately 2,767 pupils are participating in the compensatory education programs.

The broad goals of these programs are to: 1) provide intensive academic instruction to the educationally disadvantaged, 2) involve parents in the program, 3) supply students with incentives for academic improvement, 4) operate staff inservice programs, 5) measure academic growth, and 6) prepare students to effectively meet the academic competition of the general classroom. These goals are the focus of the Compensatory Education Department's activities throughout the 1987-88 school year.

PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A process evaluation involves monitoring a program throughout the year to determine if the program is being implemented as planned. This makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that influence a program's outcome. For these programs, the process evaluation was accomplished by a set of questionnaires concerning the following topics: 1) programming and instructional management; 2) communications; 3) pupil selection; and 4) miscellaneous. All compensatory education teachers and each principal at the compensatory education buildings were asked to respond on the appropriate questionnaire. The instruments were distributed to the respondents on January 4, 1988 by means of an inter-office mailing (see Appendix A for a copy of the various instruments and memos used for distribution). The completed instruments were to be returned via inter-office mail by January 15, 1988. Completed instruments were last received from respondents on January 29, 1988.

PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA

The Academic Achievement (A2) Chapter 1/Article 3 Compensatory Education Process Survey, 1987-88 (see Appendix A for copies) was sent out to A^2 teachers and their principals on January 5, 1988. As of the end of January when results were tabulated, 35 of 48 teachers (72.9%) and 22 of 26 principals (84.6%) had returned the survey instrument. The detailed tabulated results are presented in Appendix B.

What follows are the salient points stemming from this year's process evaluation efforts of the 1987-88 A^2 program. Jointly the program evaluator and the program director reviewed the results and summarized them into the following categories which are presented below: strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations.

Strengths of the A^2 Program

From a combined review of current findings and the present description of the program, the following strengths listed below appear noteworthy.

PROGRAMMING AND INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

- The student/teacher ratio appear to have been maintained at approximately 65 for elementary per day and 15 for secondary per class.
- Approximately three quarters of the teachers (70.9% elementary and 75.0% secondary) and over half of the principals (elementary 61.9% and secondary 50.0%) use an information management system to profile each student's performance on at least a monthly basis.
- All elementary and secondary principals (100%) feel the regular teacher in their buildings understand the program's purposes, selection procedures and operation in their buildings.
- Most elementary (90.5%) principals feel the A^2 staff has adequate materials to increase student achievement.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Almost all elementary (95.2%) and secondary (100.0%) principals have made a presentation at their regular staff meeting related to the identified objectives of the compensatory education program in their buildings.
- Three quarters of the secondary (75.0%) and almost half of the elementary (41.9%) A^2 teachers are aware of compensatory education parent participation in their buildings.
- All secondary (100.0%) and a majority of elementary (77.4%) A^2 teachers have had an on-site visit by the director and/or a designate to their classes this year.

MISCELLANEOUS

- The most often mentioned strengths of the A^2 program were as follows:

	Teachers		Principals	
	Ele.	Sec.	Ele.	Sec.
- Focus in on needed skills of low achieving pupils (reading and math).	X		X	X
- Relaxed and supportive environment because of small group instruction and/or individual help.	X			
- Strong dedicated and well-trained staff.			X	
- Decreases dropouts and improves attendance.				X

Weaknesses of the A^2 Program

From a combined review of current findings and the present description of the program, the following current weaknesses appear noteworthy.

PROGRAMMING AND INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

- Over 70.0% of the elementary A^2 teachers think the California Achievement Tests (CAT) do not provide an adequate measure of achievement for planning student programs.
- Almost all of the A^2 teachers (elementary 93.6% and secondary 100.0%) feel that math and reading inservice activities have been ineffective in focusing instruction.
- Most elementary compensatory education teachers (71.2%) see that setting a student to staff ratio at approximately 70 to 1 has not been generally beneficial to the program.
- Only 19.4% of the elementary and 25.0% of the secondary A^2 teachers feel that the monthly meetings provide an adequate means of satisfying their professional inservice needs.
- Half of the secondary (50.0%) principals feel that A^2 staff do not have adequate material to increase student achievement.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Nearly all elementary (90.3%) and most secondary (75.0%) A^2 teachers have not had an opportunity to air special concerns about the compensatory education program during regular building staff meetings.
- Most elementary (87.1%) and secondary (75.0%) compensatory education teachers do not keep their director informed of their activities.
- Half or more of the secondary (50.0%) and elementary (64.5%) compensatory education teachers experience pupil scheduling concerns.
- Almost all elementary (96.8%) and most secondary (75.0%) A^2 teachers do not communicate regularly with other classroom teachers regarding student progress.

PUPIL SELECTION

- Almost all elementary (93.6%) and all secondary (100.0%) compensatory education teachers feel that most needy students are not selected for participation in Chapter 1/ Article 3.

- Most elementary (80.6%) A^2 teachers know that all classroom teachers in their buildings have not been involved in compensatory education student identification efforts.

- Half of the secondary (50.0%) A^2 teachers feel all classroom teachers have been involved in Chapter 1/Article 3 student identification efforts.

MISCELLANEOUS

- The most frequently mentioned weaknesses by respondent group were the following:

	Teacher		Principal	
	Ele.	Sec.	Ele.	Sec.
- Number of students too great for every student to obtain needed help in reading and math.	X	X		X
- More practical to teach one subject area if more than one compensatory education teacher is assigned to a building.	X	X	X	X
- Lack of books/materials that are coordinated district-wide.		X	X	X
- Too little time to teach to one objective.			X	
- Difficulties in scheduling all special classes.			X	

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this year's process evaluation and conversations with the program director, the following recommendations are offered in an effort to improve the implementation of the A^2 program in the future.

1. Review and/or develop a selection instrument for students without standardized test results. A pilot testing of the new selection instrument should be undertaken to determine its technical adequacy.

2. Institute a periodic testing of identified objectives for all grade levels. These objectives would provide a basis for all compensatory teachers to chart the progress of each student and ultimately determine instructional effectiveness.

3. Continue work with the elementary inservice committee to design an appropriate set of inservice offerings for the compensatory education staff.

4. Explore other alternatives to lower the student to staff ratios. Present funding levels make it impossible to lower the ratio further without outside help from other sources.

5. Continue to define at the secondary level a standard set of reading and math materials. After the set of core materials has been identified, purchase adequate amounts for each secondary compensatory education building.

6. Record building level instructional activities that happen monthly. These activities then should be communicated through a calendar of events from each teacher to the director.

7. Identify procedures that make compensatory education scheduling easier and share these procedures during pre-service sessions at the start of the school year.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (A^2)

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

PROCESS SURVEY 1987-19

To assist in planning efforts, the Department of Evaluation, Testing, and Research requests that each Chapter 1/Article 3 staff member complete the attached questionnaire regarding program operations. Many future project endeavors will be based upon your responses and reactions to the questions contained in this instrument.

We want to obtain your individual perceptions about the programs, all responses will be kept confidential. Answer each question as it pertains to the program(s) you serve.

If you have any questions, please call Richard Claus (ext. 256).

Please complete and return the questionnaire via inter-office mail to Richard Claus, Program Evaluation Division no later than January 15, 1988.

First, please indicate in the space provided below what buildings or buildings and program populations you serve.

BUILDING(S)	SUBJECT AREAS (Check as many as apply)	
1. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
2. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
3. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
4. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
5. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
6. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____
7. _____	Reading ____	Mathematics ____

APPENDIX A

NAME: _____ **DATE:** _____

Programming and Instructional Management

1. This year changes have taken place in staffing and quotas in the Chapter 1/Article 3 buildings. Has setting a student to staff ratio at approximately 70 to 1 been generally beneficial to the program? (Check one)

   ____ No
   ____ Yes

   Comments: _____

   _____

2. Some of your inservices have emphasized information in math and reading instruction/materials, etc., we want to know if such activities have been effective in focusing instruction? (Check one)

   ____ No
   ____ Yes

   Please explain: _____

   _____

3. Nearly all of us have a management system to provide a profile of each student's performance (strengths and weaknesses). If you have such a profile, how often do you update the changes in student performance? (Check one)

   ____ Weekly
   ____ Every two weeks
   ____ Monthly
   ____ Every two months
   ____ Every semester
   ____ Other (please specify) _____

   Comments: _____

   _____

4. You and the people in your building received California Achievement Tests (CAT) Form E information. Do you think such results provide an adequate measure of achievement for planning student programs (Check one)

   ____ No
   ____ Yes

   Please explain: _____

   _____

5. Approximately how many different children do you serve in the building(s) you work and what is your service count in reading and/or mathematics?

____ Head Count (different students)
____ Service Count (duplicated count)

6. How do you primarily serve students? (Check one)

____ Pull-out format (Resource Room)
____ Within a regular classroom where students are instructed in a small group during regular classroom instruction (Push-In)
____ Self-contained classroom/team teaching
____ Other (please explain) _____

_____

7. Which of the following primarily characterize the way you serve students? (Check one)

____ No grouping
____ Ability
____ Grade/classroom
____ Objectives
____ Randomly
____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

8. What is the <u>average</u> amount of time you spend <u>each</u> week instructing each <u>pupil</u>?

____ Average time spent in hours per week per pupil

9. How long have you been teaching in the program?

____ Time in program to nearest year

10. Do the monthly meetings of the Chapter 1/Article 3 staff provide an adequate means of satisfying your professional inservice needs? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes

What can be done, if anything, to improve the inservice sessions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Which of the following have been areas covered during the inservice sessions? (Check as many as apply)

____ (1) Ways to improve coordination between regular classroom and compensatory education teachers
____ (2) New materials (Book of Lists, EDL Vocabulary Book, Power Writing, etc.)
____ (3) Calendars for compensatory education program
____ (4) Committee work
____ (5) Information relative to reading objectives
____ (6) Information relative to mathematics objectives
____ (7) Special programs (Math Their Way, Math a Way of Thinking, Virginia Soper, etc.)
____ (8) Reports about what was learned at educational conferences
____ (9) Other (please specify) _____
____ (10) Other (please specify) _____

12. What additional areas of inservice, if any, would be beneficial to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Rate the overall inservices by circling the number which best describes your assessment of these meetings.

Poor	Fair	Good
1	2	3

Communication

14. Have you or your building colleagues made any presentations at the regular building staff meetings related to identified objectives of the compensatory education program? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes

If you served more than one building, indicate buildings where presentations were made.

Building(s): _____
When: _____
By whom: _____
How many: _____

15. If you serve more than one building, are you invited to be part of the staff meetings at the buildings at which you work? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

16. Have you had an opportunity to air special aspects or concerns about the compensatory education program at regular building staff meetings? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

17. Are there any pupil scheduling problems? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes ... Please describe. _____

_____

_____

_____

18. Is there regular communication between you and classroom teachers regarding student progress? (Check one)

____ No ... Why not? _____

_____

_____

____ Yes ... Please describe. _____

_____

_____

19. Are you aware of any compensatory education parent participation in the building(s) you serve? (Check one)

____ No

____ Yes ... Please describe. _____

_____

_____

20. Has the director and/or a designate made any on-site visits to your class this year? (Check one)

____ No

____ Yes ... What were the results? _____

_____

_____

_____

21. Has the principal made a formal observation of your class this year? (Check one)

____ No

____ Yes ... What were the results? _____

_____

_____

_____

22. Do you keep your director informed of your activities? (Check one)

____ No

____ Yes ... How? _____

_____

_____

_____

Pupil Selection

23. To your knowledge, have all classroom teachers in the building(s) in which you work been involved in the Chapter 1/Article 3 student identification efforts? (Check one)

____ No
____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

24. As you know, we attempt to identify the most need students for participation in the Chapter 1/Article 3 programs. Generally, barring students that entered late, did the building(s) in which you work identify the most needy students to participate in the compensatory education programs? (Check one)

____ No ... If so, please identify exceptions. _____

_____

____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

Miscellaneous

25. Name one or two of the strengths and weaknesses of the compensatory education program.

STRENGTH	WEAKNESS
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

26. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall program?

27. Additional comments:

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the completed instrument via inter-office mail to Richard Claus at the Central Office on or before January 15, 1988.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SAGINAW

Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

TO: Elementary Principals

FROM: Richard N. Claus, Manager of Program Evaluation

RE: Elementary Principals' Chapter 1/Article 3 and State Bilingual/Migrant Process Survey

DATE: January 4, 1988

We would like you to take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire relevant to the Chapter 1 and/or Article 3 and Bilingual/ Migrant programs in your building.

Rather than ask you to fill out two separate questionnaires we have made one instrument which asks questions that are relevant to almost all programs. If you have multiple programs in your building please indicate this in the space provided and respond to all appropriate questions.

It is important for planning purposes that we obtain your perceptions about these programs. Should you have any questions please call me at ext. 256.

Please return the completed instrument via inter-office mail to the Program Evaluation Division by January 15, 1988.

RNC/tlf

Attachment

APPENDIX A

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 AND STATE BILINGUAL/MIGRANT PROCESS SURVEY—1987-1988

Building: _____

Check the programs that operate in your building:

____ Chapter 1
____ Article 3
____ State Bilingual
____ Migrant

1. Do the regular teachers in your building understand the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

2. Have you or your designated staff members had an opportunity to explain the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation to the building staff?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

3. According to the law, you as the principal are responsible for conducting, compilation, and analysis of Chapter 1/Article 3 student identification for your building. Have all classroom teachers been involved in the student identification effort?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ No
____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

4. This year changes have taken place in staffing and quotas in the Chapter 1/Article 3 buildings. Has setting a student to staff ratio at approximately 70 to 1 been generally beneficial to the program?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ Yes
____ No ... If no, please explain. _____

_____

_____

5. As you know, we attempt to identify the most needy students for participation in the Chapter 1/Article 3 programs. Did your building identify the most needy students to participate in the Chapter 1/Article 3 educational programs?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ Yes
____ No ... If no, please explain. _____

_____

_____

6. You and the people in your building received the results of the California Achievement Tests (CAT). Do you think such results provide an adequate measure of achievement for planning student programs?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Please explain: _____

_____

7. Nearly all of us have a management system to provide us with needed information to do our jobs. Teachers usually maintain such data on the strengths and weaknesses of their students. If your designated teachers maintain such data, how often do they update student performance changes?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
____ Weekly	____ Weekly
____ Every two weeks	____ Every two weeks
____ Monthly	____ Monthly
____ Every two months	____ Every two months
____ Every semester	____ Every semester
____ Other (please specify) _____	____ Other (please specify) _____
_____	_____

Comments: _____

_____

8. Do you have a copy of the teachers' schedule to see designated pupils?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

9. In your building do the designated staff members for these programs discuss the programs' building activities with you?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

10. Have you made a formal observation of the designated staff member(s) this year?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ Yes	____ Yes
____ No →	____ No →
If no, why not? _____	If no, why not? _____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

11. Check the descriptor which best describes the working relationship between the designated staff member(s) and regular classroom teachers in your building.

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ Poor	____ Poor
____ Fair	____ Fair
____ Good	____ Good
____ Excellent	____ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

12. Do the above ratings represent an improvement over last year?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
___ Yes	___ Yes
___ No →	___ No →
If no, why not? _____	If no, why not? _____

13. Do the materials in use by the designated staffs seemed adequate to increase student achievement?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
___ No	___ No
___ Yes	___ Yes

Comments: _____

14. What, if any, are the most important current problems regarding the designated programs' operation in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
1. _____	1. _____
2. _____	2. _____
3. _____	3. _____

15. What, if any, do you consider to be the designated programs' positive contributions or strengths in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

16. Additional comments:

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the completed instrument via inter-office mail to Richard Claus at the Central Office on or before January 15, 1988.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SAGINAW

Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

TO: Secondary Principals

FROM: Richard N. Claus, Manager of Program Evaluation

RE: Secondary Principals' Chapter 1/Article 3 and State Bilingual/Migrant Process Survey

DATE: January 4, 1988

We would like you or the building administrator most familiar with the programs listed above to take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire relevant to the Chapter 1 and/or Article 3 and Bilingual/ Migrant programs in your building.

Rather than ask you to fill out two separate questionnaires we have made one instrument which asks questions that are relevant to almost all programs. If you have multiple programs in your building please indicate this in the space provided and respond to all appropriate questions.

It is important for planning purposes that we obtain your perceptions about these programs. Should you have any questions please call me at ext. 256.

Please return the completed instrument via inter-office mail to the Program Evaluation Division by January 15, 1988.

RNC/tlf

Attachment

APPENDIX A

SECONDARY PRINCIPALS' CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 AND STATE BILINGUAL/MIGRANT PROCESS SURVEY—1987-1988

Building: _____

Check the programs that operate in your building:

____ Chapter 1
____ Article 3
____ State Bilingual
____ Migrant

1. Do the regular teachers in your building understand the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

2. Have you or your designated staff members had an opportunity to explain the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation to the building staff?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

3. According to the law, you as the principal are responsible for conducting, compilation, and analysis of Chapter 1/Article 3 student identification for your building. Have all classroom teachers been involved in the student identification effort?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ No
____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

4. Do you presently need the help of the Evaluation Department in conducting a more accurate and consistent needs assessment of your student populations?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ No
____ Yes

If yes, what type of help? _____

_____

_____

_____

State Bilingual/Migrant
(Check One)

____ No
____ Yes

If yes, what type of help? _____

_____

_____

_____

5. As you know, we attempt to identify the most needy students for participation in the Chapter 1/Article 3 programs. Did you building identify the most needy students to participate in the Chapter 1/Article 3 educational programs?

Chapter 1/Article 3
(Check One)

____ Yes
____ No ... If no, please explain. _____

_____

6. You and the people in your building received the results of the California Achievement Tests (CAT). Do you think such results provide an adequate measure of achievement for planning student programs?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Please explain: _____

_____

7. Nearly all of us have a management system to provide us with needed information to do our jobs. Teachers usually maintain such data on the strengths and weaknesses of their students. If your designated teachers maintain such data, how often do they update student performance changes?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
____ Weekly	____ Weekly
____ Every two weeks	____ Every two weeks
____ Monthly	____ Monthly
____ Every two months	____ Every two months
____ Every semester	____ Every semester
____ Other (please specify) _____	____ Other (please specify) _____
_____	_____

Comments: _____

_____

8. What content areas are taught?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. What is the focus of the designated program in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check as many as apply)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check as many as apply)
____ Classroom instruction	____ Classroom instruction
____ Counseling	____ Counseling
____ Resource	____ Resource
____ Tutorial	____ Tutorial
____ Other (please specify)	____ Other (please specify)
_____	_____

Comments: _____

_____

10. In your building do the designated staff members discuss the programs' building activities with you?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ No	____ No
____ Yes	____ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

11. Check the descriptor which best describes the working relationship between the staff member(s) and the counselor in your building.

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
____ Poor	____ Poor
____ Fair	____ Fair
____ Good	____ Good
____ Excellent	____ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

12. Have you made a formal observation of the designated staff member(s) this year?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
___ Yes	___ Yes
___ No →	___ No →
If no, why not? _____	If no, why not? _____
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. Do the materials in use by the designated staffs seem adequate to increase student achievement?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
___ No	___ No
___ Yes	___ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

14. Are announcements about the programs or pertinent problems about the designated programs aired at regular staff meetings?

Chapter 1/Article 3 (Check One)	State Bilingual/Migrant (Check One)
___ No	___ No
___ Yes	___ Yes

Comments: _____

_____

15. What, if any, are the most important current problems regarding the designated programs' operation in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant
1. _____	1. _____
2. _____	2. _____
3. _____	3. _____

16. What, if any, do you consider to be the designated programs' positive contributions or strengths in your building?

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant

17. Additional comments:

Chapter 1/Article 3	State Bilingual/Migrant

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the completed instrument via inter-office mail to Richard Claus at the Central Office on or before January 15, 1988.

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF THE CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 A[2] PROCESS SURVEY FOR 1987-88 OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TEACHERS (ELEMENTARY N = 31 AND SECONDARY N = 4) AND THEIR PRINCIPALS (ELEMENTARY N = 21 AND SECONDARY N = 2)

Programming and Instructional Management

1. This year changes have taken place in staffing and quotas in the Chapter 1/Article 3 buildings. Has setting a student to staff ratio at approximately 70 to 1 been generally beneficial to the program? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	23 (71.2%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (19.1%)	NA
Yes	6 (19.4%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (71.4%)	NA
No Response	2 (6.4%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (9.5%)	NA

2. Some of your inservices have emphasized information in math and reading instruction/materials, etc., we want to know if such activities have been effective in focusing instruction? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	29 (93.6%)	4 (100.0%)
Yes	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)
No Response	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)

3. Nearly all of us have a management system to provide a profile of each student's performance (strengths and weaknesses). If you have such a profile, how often do you update the changes in student performance? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Weekly	16 (51.6%)	1 (25.0%)	12 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Every Two Weeks	2 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Monthly	4 (12.9%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (50.0%)
Every Two Months	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (19.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Every Semester	4 (12.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Ongoing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (50.0%)
No Response	4 (12.9%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (9.5%)	0 (0.0%)

4. You and the people in your building received California Achievement Tests (CAT) Form E information. Do you think such results provide an adequate measure of achievement for planning student programs? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	22 (71.0%)	1 (25.0%)	7 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	8 (25.8%)	2 (50.0%)	14 (66.7%)	2 (100.0%)
No Response	1 (3.2%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

5. Approximately how many different children do you serve in the building(s) you work and what is your service count in reading and/or mathematics?

	Teachers			
	Elementary		Secondary	
	Avg.	Standard Deviation	Avg.	Standard Deviation
Head Count (Different Students)	65.1	9.7	46.3	18.9
Service Count (Duplicated Count)	90.9	16.9	60.8	20.4

6. How do you primarily serve students? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Pull-out format (Resource Room)	25	0
Within a regular classroom where students are instructed in a small group during regular classroom instruction (Push-In)	0	2
Pull-out/self contained/team teaching	5	0
Regular classroom	0	2
Pull-out and push-in	1	0

7. Which of the following primarily characterize the way you serve students? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Ability	2	0
Grade/classroom	18	2
Objectives	4	1
Randomly	0	0
Grade by objective	5	0
Ability and objective	1	1
Grade and ability/classroom	1	0

8. What is the average amount of time you spend each week instructing each pupil?

	Teachers			
	Elementary		Secondary	
	Avg.	Standard Deviation	Avg.	Standard Deviation
Average Time in Hours Per Week Per Pupil	2.4	0.8	3.8	2.0

9. How long have you been teaching in the program?

	Teachers			
	Elementary		Secondary	
	Avg.	Standard Deviation	Avg.	Standard Deviation
Time in Program to Nearest Year	10.3	6,4	3.0	1.0

10. Do the monthly meetings of the Chapter 1/Article 3 staff provide an adequate means of satisfying your professional inservice needs? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	24 (77.4%)	1 (25.0%)
Yes	6 (19.4%)	1 (25.0%)
No Response	1 (3.2%)	2 (50.0%)

What can be done, if anything, to improve the inservice sessions?

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Longer sessions (one day instead of half a day) or more inservices	4	0
Allow teachers to attend other conferences and not place limits on the number attending	1	0
Provide for a variety of approaches through inservice sessions	2	0
Needs assessment of staff to determine inservice needs of all individuals	1	1
Explanation of how teaching to one objective can be done properly to insure student mastery	1	0
How to sort out student needs effectively and then supply the needed materials to work on needs at once	3	0
Schedule sessions any time other than Monday mornings	2	0
More opportunities to brainstorm in small groups	2	1
Hold some inservices in a.m. and some in p.m. such that the same students would not miss being helped	1	0
Time organization and/or time allotted to discussion should be better organized	1	0
Inservices at least once a month or even twice	1	0

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
MEAP inservice related to new strategies to teach reading and mathematics	1	0
Conflicting philosophies and methods presented - some thought should be given to how to deal with conflict	1	0
Hear from other people from similar program in other districts	1	0
Opportunity to suggest programs and resource people for inservice sessions	1	0

11. Which of the following have been areas covered during the inservice sessions? (Check as many as apply)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Ways to improve coordination between regular classroom and compensatory education teachers	30	2
New materials (Book of Lists, EDL Vocabulary Book, Power Writing, etc.)	30	0
Calendars for compensatory education program	27	0
Committee work	15	0
Information relative to reading objectives	28	0
Information relative to mathematics objectives	30	0
Special programs (Math Their Way, Math A Way of Thinking, Virginia Soper, etc.)	29	0
Reports about what was learned at educational conferences	24	0
Individual demonstrators	2	0
New definition of reading and how to teach for compensation	1	0

12. What additional areas of inservice, if any, would be beneficial to you?

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Reluctant learner	2	0
More Virginia Soper - teaching comprehension	3	0
Continue information relative to new reading objectives on MEAP	3	0
Parental involvement component that is academic and motivational in nature	1	0
Any activity related to the new CAT or MEAP	4	0
How to teach grade level objectives when children are 1, 2, or more grade levels behind	1	1
Math Their Way (more coverage)	3	0
Meeting with other bilingual groups/compensatory education staff to share ideas	1	0
Evaluating computer management system software	0	1
Calculator use	1	0
Time management - how to get all the paper work done in the shortest amount of time such that deadlines can be met	1	0
Math (upper grades)	1	0

13. Rate the overall inservices by circling the number which best describes your assessment of these meetings.

Poor	Fair	Good
1	2	3

	Teachers			
	Elementary		Secondary	
	Avg.	Standard Deviation	Avg.	Standard Deviation
Rating	2.7	0.4	2.3	0.6

Communication

14. Have you or your building colleagues made any presentations at the regular building staff meetings related to identified objectives of the compensatory education program? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	30 (96.8%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	1 (3.2%)	2 (50.0%)	20 (95.2%)	2 (100.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

15. If you serve more than one building, are you invited to be part of the staff meetings at the buildings at which you work? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	6 (19.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)
No Response	24 (77.4%)	4 (100.0%)

16. Have you had an opportunity to air special aspects or concerns about the compensatory education program at regular building staff meetings? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	28 (90.3%)	3 (75.0%)	NA	0 (0.0%)
Yes	3 (9.7%)	1 (25.0%)	NA	2 (100.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NA	0 (0.0%)

17. Are there any pupil scheduling problems? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	11 (35.5%)	2 (50.0%)
Yes	20 (64.5%)	2 (50.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

If yes, please describe:

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Art, special programs, bilingual, etc.	3	0
Late additions (after 6 weeks)	0	2
No preparation time in schedule	1	0
Not enough time at a building	1	0
Combination classroom to be formed second semester will change schedule	1	0
Difficult to adequately cover a reading objective in three days and a math objective in two days	1	0
Combination classrooms (splits)	1	0
Reading groups by building	1	0
Bilingual	1	0
Requires input from other teachers	2	0

18. Is there regular communication between you and classroom teachers regarding student progress? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	30 (96.8%)	3 (75.0%)
Yes	1 (3.2%)	1 (25.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Staff meetings	3	0
When picking up students, informally on a periodic basis	16	0
Class II and other test data are also discussed	1	0
At the junior high level it occurs most often with special education teachers relative to mainstreamed students	0	1
Every week	1	0
Scheduled conferences with substitutes provided	2	0
Teacher/teacher conference	7	0
Very close communication/open communication involving showing student work	2	0
Discuss the need to continue practice or go onto next objective	1	0
Passes notebook back and forth	2	0
Have folder with each child's progress in reading and mathematics	1	0

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Children's work is returned daily as well as hints for teachers on how to use the same techniques with the larger group to master an objective	1	0
Special meeting between regular education teachers and me, we discuss the progress of students in compensatory education; also various teaching tips are discussed	1	0

19. Are you aware of any compensatory education parent participation in the building(s) you serve? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	16 (51.6%)	1 (25.0%)
Yes	13 (41.9%)	3 (75.0%)
No Response	2 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)

20. Has the director and/or a designate made any on-site visits to your class this year? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	6 (19.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	24 (77.4%)	4 (100.0%)
No Response	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)

21. Has the principal made a formal observation of your class this year? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	12 (38.7%)	2 (50.0%)	9 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	19 (61.3%)	2 (50.0%)	12 (57.1%)	2 (100.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

22. Do you keep your director informed of your activities? (Check one)

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
No	27 (87.1%)	3 (75.0%)
Yes	4 (12.9%)	1 (25.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Pupil Selection

23. To your knowledge, have all classroom teachers in the building(s) in which you work been involved in the Chapter 1/Article 3 student identification efforts? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	25 (80.6%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (50.0%)
Yes	6 (19.4%)	2 (50.0%)	20 (95.2%)	1 (50.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

24. As you know, we attempt to identify the most need students for participation in the Chapter 1/ Article 3 programs. Generally, barring students that entered late, did the building(s) in which you work identify the most needy students to participate in the compensatory education programs? (Check one)

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
No	29 (93.6%)	4 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Yes	2 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	21 (100.0%)	2 (100.0%)
No Response	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Miscellaneous

25. Name one or two of the strengths and weaknesses of the compensatory education program.

	Teachers		Principals	
Strength	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Focus in on needed skills of low achieving pupils (reading/math)	10	1	9	1
Relaxed and supportive environment because of small group instruction and/or individual instructional basis (small teacher/student ratio)	14	2	1	0
Due to objective timelines we are better coordinated with classroom	5	0	2	0
Motivational by providing immediate feedback to rebuild self-concept and pride in their ability to succeed	4	0	0	0
Program director	0	1	0	0
Good supply of materials	1	0	1	0
Strong, dedicated and well-trained compensatory education teachers	1	0	5	0
centive program	1	0	0	0
Dropout prevention	1	0	0	0
Extra practice for children needing drill	1	0	0	0
There is no stigma attached to the children who come to compensatory education	1	0	0	0
Program deals with both reading and mathematics for some children	3	0	0	0

APPENDIX B

Strength	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Objective based instruction in reading and math	2	0	0	0
Reduction in the number of teachers a compensatory education person works with	1	0	1	0
Meaningful inservice	3	0	0	0
Pre- and post-testing on objectives	1	0	2	0
Teacher student test-taking skills	1	0	0	0
Staff/principal cooperation	0	0	8	0
Compensatory education teachers are functioning as instructional leaders in their buildings	1	0	0	0
Good communication	1	0	1	0
Decreases dropouts and improves attendance	0	0	0	1
Improved data collection and analysis techniques	0	0	2	0
Parents are involved	0	0	1	0
None	0	0	1	0

Weakness	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Pull-out program takes time away from regular instruction	2	0	3	0
Case load too great for every student to obtain the needed help in reading and math	9	0	3	1
More practical to teach one subject area if more than one compensatory education teacher assigned to building	10	0	1	0
Lack of books/materials that are coordinated district-wide	0	3	2	2
Lack of homogeneous grouping	0	1	0	0
Lack of time for planning, teacher conferences, preparation, etc.	7	0	3	0
Traveling teachers are more a bandage approach rather than a real solution	3	0	1	0
Lack of organized parent participation	1	0	0	0
Lack of instructional leadership	1	1	0	0
Poor communication	0	1	0	0
Too little time to teach one objective	7	0	7	0
Regular education teachers perceive that compensatory education teachers don't work hard	1	0	0	0
Materials need to be objective focused	1	0	1	0
Principal doesn't understand the difference between compensatory education and regular classrooms and thus has a belief that they should both be run the same	1	0	0	0
No job description	1	0	0	0
Older staff unwilling to accept or adapt to changes	2	0	0	0

APPENDIX B

Weakness	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Stigma lowers ego	1	0	0	0
Lack of work space	0	0	3	0
Program design does not allow for building needs	0	0	2	0
Difficulties in schedule coordination	0	0	6	0
Inconsistency in discipline rules; compensatory education vs. regular education	0	0	1	0
Limited grade reporting in compensatory education	0	0	1	0
None	0	0	1	0

26. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall program?

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Focus should be only on high need objectives and how to use materials to effectively teach these objectives	1	0
Student to staff ratio should be reduced to 50 to 1	3	0
Money for materials should be provided at the beginning of the school year so these supplies could be in place as school opens	1	0
Buy enough common books for remedial students district-wide (e.g., Stein's Refresher Mathematics - needs better explanations and examples	0	2
Try to group students by ability into classes	0	1
Role definition of bilingual/compensatory education teacher	2	0
Develop resource rooms in each building to have common materials for each objective	1	0
Increase amount of "direct teaching" services in both reading and mathematics	3	0
Would not desire a second monthly meeting due to the time it would take away from "direct teaching" services	1	0
Organized parent participation component	2	0
Organize program at junior high level district-wide	0	1
Schedules should be made to include teacher input	2	0
Where there are two compensatory education teachers in a building each should teach their own discipline - reading/math (more effective just teaching one area)	7	0
Two objectives per month in both subjects should be the maximum	3	0
Continue teacher/teacher meetings	1	0
Inventory of materials to be used in the Chapter 1/Article 3 program	1	0
Eliminate traveling between schools because it disjoints staff and continuity of program	2	0
Less paperwork, with deadlines that are reasonable	1	0
If we are to continue the objective per week program, then regular education staff need to be included in the program in some way other than having the compensatory education teacher at each building act as spokes person	3	0
Use of more diagnostic instruments as well as IQ tests	1	0
Dialogue opportunities to help shape compensatory education proposal	4	0

	Teachers	
	Elementary	Secondary
Additional preparation time for incentives, multi-grade children and communication with teachers and parents	2	0
Quiet working area/space	1	0
Opportunity for building needs to help shape the compensatory education program	2	0
Increase the number of inservices on teaching techniques	1	0
Defined program structure	1	0
Old compensatory education program worked successful and thought should be given to returning to that program design	2	0
More emphasis on grades 1-3 to help prevent problems in grades 4-6	1	0

27. Additional comments:

	Teachers		Principals	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
It is obvious that Mary Ciolek is interested in raising the level of professionalism in the compensatory education program. I'm glad to see it!	2	0	0	0
At the junior high level, an organized program description should be devised through a collaborative effort	0	1	0	0
Excellent new methods both from the outside and inside have been shared through the inservices	1	0	0	0
Supportive parents	1	0	0	0
Terrific program overall with some fine tuning possible	1	0	0	0
My principal and teachers are working with us to make this a great program	1	0	0	0
This year's program has been frustrating because it has interfered with the entire building's operation	1	0	0	0
Enjoyed reading instruction in spite of having to build a program from zero materials	1	0	0	0
The program is excellent, however the limited time allotted for working with high need youngsters minimizes their growth	0	0	1	0
Compensatory education standards do not always meet individual building needs	0	0	1	0
Our Article 3 staff assistance has been drastically reduced. Increased number of students identified as needing extra assistance (new students, students without CAT scores, increased high needs students) are not receiving assistance	0	0	1	0
I often hear of a district decision or program from a compensatory education staff member BEFORE this information is formally shared in the principal's meeting. While this is a minor point in comparison to the program's strengths, it should be addressed	0	0	1	0

APPENDIX B

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3
PROCESS SURVEY 1987-88 (N = 21)
UNIQUE QUESTIONS

1. Do the regular teachers in your building understand the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation in your building?

	Elementary Principals	
No	0	(0.0%)
Yes	21	(100.0%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

2. Do you have a copy of the teachers' schedule to see designated pupils?

	Elementary Principals	
No	0	(0.0%)
Yes	21	(100.0%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

3. In your building do the designated staff members for these programs discuss the programs' building activities with you?

	Elementary Principals	
No	0	(0.0%)
Yes	21	(100.0%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

4. Check the descriptor which best describes the working relationship between the designated staff member(s) and regular classroom teachers in your building.

	Elementary Principals	
Poor	1	(4.8%)
Fair	0	(0.0%)
Good	12	(57.1%)
Excellent	7	(33.3%)
No Response	1	(4.8%)

5. Do the above ratings represent an improvement over last year?

	Elementary Principals	
Yes	14	(66.7%)
No	6	(28.6%)
No Response	1	(4.8%)

If no, why not?

1.	Consistently "good"	1
2.	Excellent services but drastically cut	1
3.	Program not in building last year	4
4.	No Response	2

6. Do the materials in use by the designated staffs seem adequate to increase student achievement?

	Elementary Principals	
No	2	(9.5%)
Yes	19	(90.5%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

APPENDIX B

SECONDARY PRINCIPALS' CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS SURVEY 1987-88 (N = 2) UNIQUE QUESTIONS

1. Do the regular teachers in your building understand the programs' purposes, selection procedures, and operation in your building?

	Secondary Principals	
No	0	(0.0%)
Yes	2	(100.0%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

2. Do you presently need the help of the Evaluation Department in conducting a more accurate and consistent needs assessment of your student populations?

	Secondary Principals	
No	1	(50.0%)
Yes	1	(50.0%)
No Response	0	(0.0%)

3. What content areas are taught?

	Secondary Principals	
Reading	2	(100.0%)
Mathematics	2	(100.0%)

4. What is the focus of the designated program in your building. (Check as many as apply)

	Secondary Principals	
Classroom Instruction	2	(100.0%)
Counseling	2	(100.0%)
Resource	1	(50.0%)
Tutorial	1	(50.0%)
Parental Involvement	2	(100.0%)

5. Check the descriptor which best describes the working relationship between the staff member(s) and the counselor in your building.

	Secondary Principals	
Poor	0	(0.0%)
Fair	0	(0.0%)
Good	1	(50.0%)
Excellent	1	(50.0%)

6. Do the materials in use by the designated staffs seem adequate to increase student achievement?

	Secondary Principals	
No	1	(50.0%)
Yes	1	(50.0%)